



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,272	09/21/2005	Blake R Weiler	A35285-PCT-USA (065855.03)	4315
21003 7590 07/21/2009 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA 44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498				
EXAMINER NAJARIAN, LENA				
ART UNIT 3686		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 07/21/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DL.NYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,272

Applicant(s)

WEILER ET AL.

Examiner

LENA NAJARIAN

Art Unit

3686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SD/CS)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20041209
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Under the statute, the claimed invention must fall into one of the four recognized statutory classes of invention, namely, a process (or method); a machine (or system); an article of manufacture; or a composition of matter.

In order to qualify as a statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state. The recited steps of independent claim 1 of merely receiving an indication of a selected report type, accessing data, analyzing the data, and formatting a report are not tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) and do not transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Therefore, claims 1-9 are deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

3. Claims 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 16 recites a "logic arrangement for accessing data." The current claim language does not clarify that a computer processor or structure is part of the recited system or that the recited elements (i.e. the logic arrangement) are embodied on a computer readable medium.

Logic arrangements not embodied on a computer readable media are considered descriptive material. They are therefore considered non-statutory because they are not capable of causing a functional change in a computer. As drafted, the claim fails to define any structural and functional interrelationships between the logic arrangement and other elements of a computer that permit the computer program's function to be realized. (See MPEP 2106)

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must also produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Under this analysis, the present language of claims 16-21 merely recites non-functional descriptive material, as no recitation of executable code being embodied on any medium or data structure is provided. Simply stated, the "logic arrangement" as recited in claim 16 fails to have a tangible result.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the invention of claims 16-21 does not have a tangible result, and thus fails to recite the practical application of an abstract idea to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robin (US 2002/0005935 A1).

(A) Referring to claim 1, Robin discloses a method for analyzing prescription data, comprising the steps of:

receiving an indication of a selected report type (para. 106 of Robin);

accessing at least one from the group consisting of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data based at least in part on the selected report type (para. 106 and para. 110 of Robin);

analyzing the accessed at least one from the group consisting of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data (para. 20 and para. 63 of Robin); and

formatting a report of the selected report type including the accessed at least one from the group consisting of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data (para. 106 of Robin).

(B) Referring to claim 2, Robin discloses wherein the selected report type is a product oriented report (Fig. 34A, para. 73, and Fig. 19 of Robin).

(C) Referring to claim 3, Robin discloses wherein the selected report type is a patient oriented report (para. 73 and para. 106 of Robin).

(D) Referring to claim 4, Robin discloses wherein the selected report type is a prescriber oriented report (abstract, Fig. 34A, and para. 73 of Robin).

(E) Referring to claim 7, Robin discloses wherein the report includes proportions of valid values for a data attribute (Fig. 34B and para. 106 of Robin).

(F) Referring to claim 8, Robin discloses wherein the data attribute includes at least one from a group consisting of category, patient gender, patient age, and patient gender by age combination (Fig. 34B and para. 106 of Robin).

(G) Referring to claim 10, Robin discloses a system for accessing sales data, comprising:

a data storage device including a database and configured to receive a data access request indicating a selected report type, accesses at least one of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data based at least in part on the selected report type, and transmit data responsive to the data access request (para. 106, para. 110, and Fig. 35 of Robin); and

a server coupled to said data storage device and configured to receive an indication of a selected report type, send a data access request to the data storage device, receive the at least one of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented

longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data from the data storage device, analyze the at least one of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data, and format a report of the selected report type including the at least one of product oriented longitudinal data, patient oriented longitudinal data and prescriber oriented longitudinal data (para. 106, para. 20, para. 63, para. 110, and Fig. 35 of Robin).

(H) Claims 13-14, 16, and 19-20 repeat the same limitations as claims 7, 8, and 1, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robin (US 2002/0005935 A1) in view of *Official Notice*.

(A) Referring to claims 5 and 6, Robin does not expressly disclose wherein the longitudinal data covers a range of time of at least twelve months in duration and at most six years.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known at the time the invention was made to limit data based on time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set a time range of twelve months to 6 years with the motivation of only including data relevant to the analysis.

(B) Claims 11, 12, 17, and 18 repeat the same limitations as claims 5 and 6, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above.

8. Claims 9, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robin (US 2002/0005935 A1) in view of Becker (US 2003/0125609 A1).

(A) Referring to claim 9, Robin does not disclose wherein each of the proportions is associated with a confidence interval, wherein the confidence interval describes the reliability of the proportion.

Becker discloses wherein each of the proportions is associated with a confidence interval, wherein the confidence interval describes the reliability of the proportion (para. 5-7 of Becker).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the aforementioned features of Becker within Robin. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide reliable assessments of health status (para. 2 of Becker).

(B) Claims 15 and 21 repeat the same limitations as claim 9, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons given above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches methods of providing customized gene annotation reports (US 2003/0113756 A1); systems and methods for managing biological data and providing data interpretation tools (US 2003/0233250 A1); electronic report making supporting apparatus, method, and program (US 2004/0186747 A1); and systems and methods for creating and online viewing of pathology reports (US 2003/0177041 A1).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LENA NAJARIAN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:30 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-6787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or (571) 272-1000.

/L. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3686
In
7/14/09

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3686